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Reported crime is currently shifting away from petty crime such as theft and burglary towards more complicated felonies associated with development of information technologies like cybercrime (NOU2017:09, 2017). In addition to increased citizen awareness of civil right, police forces experience higher expectation from the public concerning efficiency, quality and information (NOU2017:09, 2017). These changes pose considerable challenges for the police organization which require them to rapidly evolve in order to best promote and consolidate citizens’ security and general welfare (NOU2017:09, 2017; Yilmaz, 2013). To overcome the challenges today and in the future, different police reforms have been developed and implemented in order to secure employees’ theoretical proficiency (NOU2017:09, 2017). These reforms are bound to have massive structural ramifications. For instance, the latest reform (“Nærpolitireformen”) have resulted in gradual reduction of the police districts from 27 to 12 regional districts (Prop.61LS, 2014-2015). Furthermore, adapting from the change literature, we know that approximately two-thirds of organizational changes fail (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Burns & Jackson, 2011), signifying the importance of deliberately manage change initiatives (Burnes, 2004; Yilmaz, 2013).

This have resulted in increased interest among researchers recommending comprehensive approaches towards change (e.g., Burnes, 2004). However, recent scholars have supported the view that most change initiatives that fails is not caused by poor planning or implementation. Failure is rather caused by a conflict between the organization’s values and a specific approach towards change (Burnes, 2004; Burnes & Jackson, 2011; Gundhus, 2017). This have yielded increased interest in the field of organizational change, and Yilmaz (2013) suggested that Police organizations should focus on creating an alignment between future reforms and organizational values and procedures (organizational climate) in order to promote Police Officer’s Readiness for Change. However, research on the relationship between organizational climate and employee’s Readiness for Change is still warranted.

Accordingly, this study will take a climate approach by investigating whether the climate types related to the Competing Values Framework facilitate Readiness for Change. The framework was originally developed by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983), and have later been recognizes as a comprehensive conceptualization of organizational climate (Albrecht, 2014; Kuenzi, 2008; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; Patterson et al., 2005).

Additionally, this study explores the mediating role of Organizational Commitment between organizational climate and employee’s Readiness for Change. Organizational Commitment refers to an individual’s attachment and identification with organizations (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Even though Organizational Commitment have been linked to a wide range of positive behaviors, studies examining how Organizational commitment might
facilitate reactions towards change is still limited. While some authors have argued that commitment is an important pre-change antecedent (Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011), others have argued that commitment might obstruct willingness to accept organizational change (Oreg et al., 2011). Thus, research examining this relationship is still needed.

The aim of this study is to examine the gap in the organizational climate literature by examining whether the climates related to the Competing Values Framework (CVF) facilitates employee’s Readiness for Change within the Norwegian Police Service. Specifically, in what degree each of the four climate types within the CVF predicts Readiness for change, and the potential mediating role of Organizational Commitment. The thesis will first address the Competing Values Framework, followed by Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change. Thirteen hypotheses are then suggested before presentation of the results, followed by discussion, implication, limitation, and suggestions for future research.

**Organizational Climate**

Organizational Climate can be conceptualized as the way people describe and experience their work settings (Benjamin Schneider, Ehrhart, & Macey, 2013), and is considered an important predictor of employee’s behavior (Patterson et al., 2005; B Schneider, González-Romá, Ostroff, West, & Chen, 2017). Even though the concept of Organizational Climate previously suffered from conflicting definitions, there is an emerging agreement among researchers of defining Organizational Climate in terms of employees’ shared perception of organizational policies, practices and procedures that an organization reward, supports and expects (Carr, Schmidt, Ford, Deshon, & Zedeck, 2003; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). This definition implies that organizational climate entails organizational activities (practices and procedures). Essentially, this definition allows researchers to distinguish between climate and related organizational constructs such as organizational culture (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). As this study aims to examine attitudes as outcome variables, and attitudes are derived from affective, cognitive, and behavioral information (Crites, Fabrigar, & Petty, 1994; Eagly & Chaiken, 2007), this study will take a climate approach accordingly. Additionally, researchers have found that organizational climate mediates between organizational culture and several individual outcomes such as job satisfaction, commitment and turnover (Aarons & Sawitzky, 2006).

Within the organizational climate literature, there have been a general tendency of discriminating between global- and focus climate (Kuenzi, 2008; Lone et al., 2017). The two emphases of climate are distinct by the amount of complexity and information gathered at a specific time, ranging from broad and large (global climate) to a small and more narrow (focus climate) (Carr et al., 2003). Thus, focus climate is related to a specific aspect of climate
(Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009), such as climate for safety (e.g., Zohar & Campbell, 1980), climate for justice (e.g., Colquitt, Noe, & Jackson, 2002) or service climate (e.g., B Schneider, White, & Paul, 1998). The research of focused climate have acknowledged how different climate types predicts specific outcome variables, however it does not account for how these climates might work together (Kuenzi, 2008). Conversely, global climate attempts to describe the total situational influence in organizations and how this might relate to specific outcomes (Carr et al., 2003; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). That is to say that global climate is thought to account for all focused climates that might simultaneously exist within an organization. Consequently, accounting for how different aspects of climate might work together in order to predict outcome variables (Kuenzi, 2008).

Competing Values Framework

Global climate has emerged as a way to understand organizational outcomes and have become foundation for understanding organizational effectiveness (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). This is because an effective organization is argued to have values and goals that are shared among employees (Burnes & Jackson, 2011). As a result, several researchers have argued that global climate could be conceptualized and measured through the Competing Values Framework (CVF) (Kuenzi, 2008; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; Lone et al., 2017; Patterson et al., 2005). Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) derived the CVF from sorting organizations effectiveness criteria according to three axes of value dimensions. These three dimensions, referred to as focus, structure and means-ends, reflects basic and competing dilemmas in any organization. The first dimension is related to organizational focus and differentiate between an internal emphasis on well-being and development of employees from an external emphasis of the organization itself relative to the marked. The second value dimension, structure, differentiates between an organization’s emphasis on stability from an emphasis on flexibility. The last value dimension is related to the organizations means and ends, and consist of behavior (means) through which the organization will ideally achieve a desired outcomes, or established effectiveness criteria (ends) (Hartnell, Ou, & Kinicki, 2011; Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

Kuenzi (2008) argues that CVF’s value dimensions are reflected in policies, procedures and practices of the organization, and that there is each employee’s perception of these policies, practices and procedures in each of the four CVF’s dimensions that make up the organizations climate. In other words, climate is related to employee’s behavior, thus should climate be more reflected in the means, rather than ends, of each of the four climate dimensions.
Altogether, these three value dimensions will further yield four competing, but not exclusive, climate orientation; Human Relation climate, Open System climate, Internal Process climate and Rational Goal climate (Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Whereas the Human Relation orientation emphasizes on a flexible work structure with an internal focus. Well-being, growth and commitment of individuals are deemed important outcomes, and achieved through cohesion and moral (Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). The Internal Process climate is internally focused, but places a great deal of emphasis on stability and control which are achieved through formal rules and procedures, in addition to stress the importance of information management and communication (Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). The Open System orientation is externally oriented with a flexible work structure, an emphasizes the importance of change and innovation as important outcomes (Patterson et al., 2005), achieved through individuals readiness and flexibility (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Lastly, the Rational Goal climate is externally oriented and emphasizes stability and control, where planning and goal setting are considered important to attain productivity and effectiveness (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983).

One of the original assumptions of the CVF is that the framework consists of competing values. Each climate has “neighboring” climates that shares the same structure or focus and are therefore presumed to be related. In the same way, each of the climate have an
opposing climate with which it shares no similarities (Quinn & McGrath, 1982). In other words, although organizations can have emphasis on each climate, it is assumed that organizations will not emphasize each climate equally because of a continuous value trade-off (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). This has raised the presumption that all organizations have one “dominant” climate. In order to identify this dominant climate, researchers have often used ipsative measure (forced choice response format) (e.g., Colley, Lincolne, & Neal, 2013). However, an ipsative score only represents the relative strength of a construct rather than the absolute score (H. Baron, 1996). In addition, Hartnell et al. (2011) argued that the presence of a “dominant” climate does not necessarily mean an absence of other climates. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983, p. 374) also stated that “although certain pairs of concepts are at opposite locations in value space and, therefore, are paradoxical in nature, this does not require that they are empirical opposites, mutually exclusive in actual organizational environment”. Thus, in order to measure the absolute score of the organizations climate one should account for all four climates. This is also helpful in order to identify how these climates will work together in order to predict outcome variables.

**Organizational commitment**

Organizational Commitment have traditionally been described as employee’s attachment and identification with one’s organization (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). However, there have been much debate on how Organizational Commitment should be defined and conceptualized. Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian (1974) defined organizational commitment in terms of employee’s identification with the organization, willingness to strive on behalf of the organization, and desire to remain employed. In contrast, Allen and Meyer (1990) conceptualized commitment according to their three-component model consisting of affective commitment (emotional attachment to the organization), continuance commitment (cost associated with leaving the organization) and normative commitment (felt obligation towards the organization) (Allen & Meyer, 1996; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002). The three-component model has since been the dominant view on how to conceptualize Organizational Commitment, and therefore extensively researched (e.g., Meyer et al., 2002; Yousef, 2017). However, the affective commitment has generally received most support as it is more strongly associated with work-related outcomes (Judge & Kammeyer Mueller, 2012; Meyer et al., 2002; Rhoades, Eisenberger, Armeli, & Murphy, 2001).

Recent researchers have criticized the three-component model, specifically normative- and continuance commitment components, for truly measuring employees attitudes towards a specific behavior (i.e. whether or not to stay employed), rather than measuring an attitude towards a specific object (i.e. the organization) (e.g., Klein, Molloy, & Brinsfield, 2012;
This criticism emerged as a result of researchers defining commitment in terms of an attitude towards an object (i.e. the organization) (Judge, Weiss, Kammeyer-Mueller, & Hulin, 2017; Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986). Attitudes are often defined as “a psychological tendency to evaluate an object with a particular degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 1). Solinger et al. (2008, p. 75) argued that “as the behavioral expression of attitudes toward targets changes over time, an attitude toward a target and an attitude towards specific behavior cannot meaningfully reflect a single underlying construct”. Thus suggesting that the continuance and normative component of the three-component model as defined by Allen and Meyer (1990) is inadequate to reflect employee’s attitude towards organizations.

The tripartite attitude theory describes attitudes as individual’s judgement about an object that can be derived from both cognitive, affective and behavioral information (Crites et al., 1994; Eagly & Chaiken, 2007). Solinger et al. (2008) adapted this theory and reconceptualized Organizational Commitment as a tripartite attitude. Following this theory, then commitment is fostered through; a) an automatic association between the employer organization and a feeling that is developed through a continuous conditioning process (affective), b) thinking and reasoning about the organization (cognitive), and c) the choice to act in order to serve and enhance the organizations interest (behavioral) (Solinger, Hofmans, & Olffen, 2015; Solinger et al., 2008). Thus, individuals that are highly committed to an organization are argued to maintain an effort towards the organization’s goals and best interest due to a value-based assessment that follows interactions at work resulting in an favorable evaluation of the organization (Judge et al., 2017).

One of the most dominant assumptions in job attitudes literature, is that job attitudes can predict employees’ behaviors (Judge & Kammeyer Mueller, 2012; Judge et al., 2017). In fact, job attitudes has been linked to several organizational behavior such as job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001), turnover (Porter et al., 1974) and organizational citizenship behavior (Ilies, Fulmer, Spitzmuller, Johnson, & Kozlowski, 2009; Meyer et al., 2002). Following this presumption, then Solinger et al. (2008) conceptualization of Organizational Commitment as a tripartite attitude might be better suited in predicting a range of organizational behaviors, compared to the normative and continuous component in the three-component model. It should be noted that Allen & Meyer’s affective commitment might resemble the affective base of commitment suggested by Solinger et al. (2008). However, these should not be confused as the each of the components in the three-component model reflects the attitude as a whole. Whereas the affective base of attitudes refers to affective information that is one part of the whole attitude (Solinger et al., 2015). That is why, if the
whole attitude is of interest (i.e. commitment towards the organization), then a summary measure mixing both affective, cognitive and behavioral base of attitude is appropriate.

**Readiness for Change**

There has been a growing consensus among researchers upon the key-role individuals’ reaction to organizational change have in determining potential change success (Bartunek, Rousseau, Rudolph, & Depalma, 2006; Oreg et al., 2011). Among these reactions is individuals Readiness for Change, which have received a great amount of attention in recent research (e.g., Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005). Armenakis, Harris, and Mossholder (1993, p. 681) defined Readiness for Change as “organizational members’ beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and the organization’s capacity to successfully make those changes”. Hence, Readiness for Change reflects the extent to which an individual or individuals are cognitively and emotionally disposed to accept, embrace, and adopt a particular change (Armenakis et al., 1993; Holt & Vardaman, 2013). An employee ready for change will show a positive and proactive attitude toward changes, thus exhibit a willingness to support and confidence in the organizations ability for succeeding in a upcoming change process (Armenakis et al., 1993; Vakola, 2014), consequently it considered one of the main factors leading to successful change implementations (Weiner, Amick, & Lee, 2008).

Armenakis et al. (1993) original definition implies that Readiness for Change consists of three components; beliefs, attitudes and intentions. However, they only proposed two beliefs as key components in creating Readiness for Change, including the belief that change is needed (discrepancy) and the belief that they have the ability to succeed in change (efficacy) (Armenakis et al., 1993). Armenakis and Harris (2002) expanded this work by adding three more beliefs as important components in creating Readiness for Change. First, they suggested that the individual needs to believe that the suggested change is appropriate (appropriateness). Secondly, they need to believe that the organization will support the suggested change by providing adequate information and resources (principal support). The final component is personal valance and is described as the belief that a particular change will be beneficial for the self. Armenakis et al. (1993) suggested that these beliefs could be altered through the message for change. Three conveying strategies for delivering the message was suggested; persuasive communication (direct communication), active participation (involving people in change activities) and managing internal and external information (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Armenakis et al., 1993)

While Armenakis et al. (1993) and Armenakis and Harris (2002) work addresses beliefs, it does not examine neither attitudes or intentions. However, in more recent work,
Rafferty, Jimmieson, and Armenakis (2013) proposed that intentions should not be considered a component of Readiness for Change. Yet, attitudes are judgments about an object that can be derived from both cognitive, affective, and behavioral information (Crites et al., 1994; Eagly & Chaiken, 2007). Rafferty et al. (2013) argued that the cognitive component of attitudes towards change would be developed through the change message proposed by Armenakis et al. (1993). The change message, including the active participation, might also be part of developing attitudes towards change. Furthermore, Holt, Armenakis, Feild, and Harris (2007, p. 235) defined Readiness for Change as the extent to which an individual is “cognitively or emotionally inclined to accept, embrace and adopt a particular plan to purposefully alter the status quo”, thus embracing the affective component of attitudes towards change. Several studies have supported this notion about affect being an important component in the Readiness for Change construct (e.g., Madsen et al., 2005; Vakola, 2014). Consequently, an additional component for creating Readiness for Change was suggested “the individual’s current and future-oriented positive affective emotional response to a specific change event” (Rafferty et al., 2013, p. 116).

**Hypotheses**

As the Norwegian Police is currently experiencing major structural changes, as a result of the local police reform (i.e. “Nærpolitireformen”) (Prop.61LS, 2014-2015), the overall aim of this study is to examine organizational climate and organizational commitment as potential facilitators of Readiness for Change. First of all, Organizational Commitment is argued to be an important predictor of successful police reforms (Yilmaz, 2013), yet the support for this argument is still limited. Therefore, this study will contribute to this gap of literature by examining whether commitment is positively associated with Readiness for Change. Additionally, Burnes and Jackson (2011) argued that most approaches to change that fails is caused by not accounting for the organization’s values and procedures. Thus, this study will take a global climate approach towards organizational change. One of the most recognized model used to measure organizational climate is the Competing Values Framework (CVF) (Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). However, studies examining the relationship between the four climates proposed by the CVF and outcomes are still limited (Kuenzi, 2008).

**The Relationship between Competing Values Framework and Readiness for Change**

In line with Armenakis et al. (1993) model for creating Readiness for Change, then direct communication, active participation and managing internal and external information is perceived as supporting employee’s beliefs and attitudes towards change. According to this theory, these strategies will support employee’s beliefs about discrepancy, efficacy,
appropriateness, principal support, personal valance, and positive affective response to change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Rafferty et al., 2013). Furthermore, Eby, Adams, Russell, and Gaby (2000) argued that contextual factors have to encourage change in order for organizational change to be successful. This has been supported by several studies illustrating a relationship between organizational characteristics and readiness for change (Jones, Jimmieson, & Griffiths, 2005; Oreg et al., 2011; Vakola, 2014). Additionally, Readiness for Change is described in terms of employee’s attitudes towards change. Whereas climate is behaviorally oriented, attitude is derived in part by behavioral information, then climate should be part of predicting individual’s Readiness for Change. In addition to several authors arguing that organizational values are important for predicting successful change (Burnes, 2004; Burnes & Jackson, 2011). Hence, the CVF’s three value dimensions will further be argued to differently support Armenakis and Harris (2002) model for creating Readiness for Change.

**Human relation climate and readiness for change.** The Human Relation climate is characterized by a flexible work structure, internal focus and emphasis on well-being, cohesion and human resource development (Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). First and foremost, researchers have suggested that a supportive environment and trust in peers have been recognized as important antecedents of Readiness for Change (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007; Jones et al., 2005; Oreg et al., 2011). This might be explained by supportive environments encouraging employee’s affective response to change (Rafferty et al., 2013). Human Relation climate is argued to encourage a supportive environment through emphasis on cohesion and well-being. Thus, this might increase the likelihood for motivating employees prior to and during organizational change.

Secondly, this climate emphasizes communication within the organization (Patterson et al., 2005), and might therefore support employee’s beliefs and attitudes towards change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Armenakis et al., 1993). In addition, flexible work structure has been empirically associated with increased Readiness for Change (Eby et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2005). This might be due to flexible work environments allowing employees to actively participate in change activities, which again is argued to promote their attitudes towards change (Rafferty et al., 2013).

On the other side, the Human Relation climate’s internal focus, might result in difficulties in creating discrepancy between a desired end-state and current state. However, this climate is also associated with emphasize on training and development of human resources, which might increase employees’ confidence regarding ability to success in a specific change (efficacy). Research have supported this by showing that employees’ are more
ready for change when they report higher levels of acquired job knowledge and skills (Hanpachern, Griego, & Morgan, 1998). In fact, Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) argued that employees have to feel adequately trained and informed in order to reduce fear and uncertainty associated with organizational change. To summarize, Human Relation climate will likely support employee’s beliefs and attitudes towards change through a supportive environment, emphasis on communication and ensuring that employees are adequately trained. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1a:** There is a positive direct effect between Human Relation climate and Readiness for Change.

**Internal process climate and readiness for change.** The Internal Process Climate is internally focused and emphasizes stability and control (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). This climate will likely emphasize communication and information management (Patterson et al., 2005), and as previously illustrated, communication will likely encourage employee’s positive beliefs towards change. However, as this climate is internally focused, they might not use external information when communication about change. Patterson et al. (2005) argued that Internal Process climate will tend to minimize or ignore external influences. They also argued that this climate will value already established ways above new initiatives. External information is deemed important for promoting positive beliefs about new change initiatives in order to illustrate how current performance differ from what the external marked expects of the organization. Armenakis and Harris (2002) argued that using external sources to illustrate the discrepancy and appropriateness of upcoming change initiative, is considered more believable for employees. External sources might include sharing relevant articles or hiring expert speakers. Research have supported this by illustrating that organizations need to provide adequate information regarding upcoming change in order to promote positive reactions to change (Elving, 2005; Oreg et al., 2011; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). Given that external information is perceived more believable, then this climate might also stimulate employee’s to believe that they are not adequately informed, thus decreasing employee’s principal support towards change. In short, Internal Process climate is suggested to fail in promoting employee’s beliefs and attitudes towards change as they are internally focused and will likely minimize or ignore external influences. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1b:** There is a negative direct effect between Internal Process climate and Change Readiness.

**Open system climate and readiness for change.** As previously discussed, in line with Armenakis et al. (1993) model for creating Readiness for Change, then employee’s
active participation in change activities is believed to facilitate employee’s positive beliefs and attitudes towards change. The Open System climate emphasis on flexible work procedures and innovative approaches (Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), might encourage employees to actively participate in new change initiatives. In addition, responsiveness to external requirements, also entails that illustrating how current performance differ from a desired outcome (i.e. discrepancy) might be well received, thus increasing employee’s beliefs about the need for change. On the other side, they will probably lack the feeling of a supportive environment, which previously have been illustrated as an important antecedent for creating Readiness for Change. By emphasizing on being in constant readiness in order to quickly adapt to external requirements, suggests that that employees might be in constant principal support for organizational change.

Additionally, this climate emphasizes resource acquisition (Quinn & McGrath, 1982; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), meaning that employee’s will feel adequately resourced at any given time. Open System climate will therefore likely support employee’s belief about the organization’s ability to manage a particular change implementation (i.e. efficacy). In sum, Open System climate is believed to support employee’s positive attitudes and beliefs about change through emphasis on being responsive, flexible, externally focused and providing employees with sufficient resources. The following hypothesis is proposed accordingly:

**H1c:** There is a positive direct effect between Open system climate and Change Readiness

**Rational goal climate and readiness for change.** The Rational Goal climate is externally oriented and emphasize control and structure, with ends of being productive and efficient (Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Hornung and Rousseau (2007) found support suggesting that jobs allowing employees to be proactive led to higher acceptance of organizational change. This might be seen in connection with Armenakis et al. (1993) active participation strategy, suggesting that gradually building skills, knowledge and efficacy will promote positive attitudes and beliefs towards change. These results imply that practices and procedures associated with Rational Goal Climate (e.g., efficiency, productivity and goal setting) might support employee’s positive attitudes and beliefs about organizational change.

On the other side, the controlling structure might also inhibit employee’s opportunities to be actively involved in change activities. However, Rational Goal climate is externally oriented, meaning that they will be responsive to external demands. As discrepancy is often illustrated to employees by clarifying how the organization current performance diverge from an anticipated end-state (Armenakis & Harris, 2002). This tentatively suggests that an
externally oriented climate will support employee’s belief of the need for change. Management are also likely to use external sources to enlighten employees regarding the *discrepancy*. Additionally, as this climate focuses on planning and clearly defining goals across the organization (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), employees will probably feel that they receive sufficient information throughout the change process, thus increasing the perceived *appropriateness* of a specific change. In brief, Rational Goal climate is thought to promote employee’s support for change through allowing employees to be proactive, being responsive to external demands, and providing employees with goals and plans prior to change.

Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H1d:** There is a positive direct effect between Rational Goal climate and Change Readiness

### The Relationship between Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change

Organizational Commitment reflects individual’s bond with the organization, and is reflected in an affective attachment, internalization of goals and values, and willingness to put an effort to support the organization’s goals (Judge & Kammeyer Mueller, 2012). According to Judge et al. (2017), highly committed individuals should maintain an effort towards the organization’s goals, even when such behavior is perceived unprofitable for themselves. Hence, suggesting that commitment can diminish potential concerns employee’s might have as a result of organizational change. Support for this have been demonstrated by Begley, Czajka, and Schmitt (1993) who found that organizational commitment acted as a buffer against change related stress, demonstrating that being committed to an organization might be beneficial in times of change. This indicates that highly committed employee’s might be prone to support and embrace new change initiatives. Some scholars have argued that highly committed employees might want to preserve things as they are (Oreg et al., 2011), and consequently refuse to see why change is needed. However, several authors have supported a positive relationship between organizational commitment and positive attitudes towards change (e.g., Madsen et al., 2005; Vako & Nikolaou, 2005), demonstrating that organizational commitment should be positively related to Readiness for Change.

Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H2:** There is a positive direct effect between Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change

### The Relationship between Competing Values Framework and Organizational Commitment

As previously deliberated, Organizational Commitment is an attitude derived from affective responses, thinking and reasoning about the organization, and behavioral tendency
to act in accordance to the organizations goals and values (Solinger et al., 2008). It is therefore argued that important antecedents is both individual characteristics and contextual factors (Judge & Kammeyer Mueller, 2012; Judge et al., 2017; Meyer et al., 2002). However, Meyer et al. (2002) found in their meta-analysis that previous work experience was an important antecedent of developing organizational commitment. Accordingly, as organizational climate is employee’s perception on procedures and practices based on past experiences, then climate should be able to predict organizational commitment. In fact, there have been a growing trend indicating a positive relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment (Carr et al., 2003; Judge et al., 2017; Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009; B Schneider et al., 2017). This relationship has also been prominent in previous research on police climate (Kuo, 2015).

**Human relation climate and organizational commitment.** Solinger et al. (2015) found that the affective base of organizational commitment was the most resistant to change, as it is the most consistent over time, compared to the cognitive and behavioral base of organizational commitment. They also found evidence yielding a precedence of the cognitive base of organizational commitment through times of change, demonstrating the importance of providing employees with detailed and clear information through these times. Similarly, previous research suggests that considerate and supportive work environment fosters organizational commitment (Fisher, Kozlowski, & Chen, 2014; Judge et al., 2017; Kuo, 2015; Meyer et al., 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001). Hence, in order to promote Organizational Commitment, organizations should invest in making an emotional connection with employees, provide clear and detailed information and secure employees long term goals (e.g., through human resource development) (Klein et al., 2012; Solinger et al., 2015). On the other side, this is not applicable for all Human Resource practices. Klein et al. (2012) argued that Human Resource practices that restrains the employee would not be expected to create commitment. However, the Human Relation climate is argued to support Organizational Commitment through cohesion, trust, belongingness, and human resource development (Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Accordingly, human relation climate should be suitable for promoting employee’s organizational commitment, and the following hypothesis where made:

**H3a:** There is a positive direct effect between Human Relation Climate and Organizational Commitment

Based on the hypothesized positive direct effect among variables, an indirect effect between Human Relation climate, Organizational Commitment and Readiness for change is proposed. Thus, predicting the following:
**H4a:** There is a positive indirect effect between Human Relation Climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment

**Internal process climate and organizational commitment.** A study of police officers showed a significant correlation between formalization, (i.e. well defined rules and procedures) and officers’ organizational commitment, however this effect was quite small at .22 (standardized beta coefficient) (Lambert, Qureshi, Klahm, Smith, & Frank, 2017). However, climate emphasizing on internal communication, is suggested to provide individuals with guidance and structure. Hence, employees rating their organizational climate to be dominant in Internal Process approaches might have a distinct picture of what is expected of them (role clarity), which in turn have been suggested to predict organizational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). However, as previously demonstrated, social support and considerate relationship with co-workers are among the most prominent predictors of Organizational Commitment, which the bureaucratic structure of Internal Process climate could have difficulties in providing. The controlling structure associated with the Internal Process climate might restrict employee’s from engaging in the organizations goals, which is an important expression of Organizational Commitment (Judge & Kammeyer Mueller, 2012).

On the other side, the climate is likely to emphasize information management, and as Solinger et al. (2015), the cognitive base of commitment (i.e. reasoning and thinking about the organization) is mainly developed through how information is received. To summarize, Internal Process climate is suggested to promote Organizational Commitment by providing role clarity and by internally communicating with employees. Hence, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H3b:** There is a positive direct effect between Internal Process Climate and Organizational Commitment

Grounded in previously hypothesizes relationship between variables, there is also presumed to be an indirect effect between Internal Process climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H4b:** There is a positive indirect effect between Internal Process Climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment

**Open system climate and readiness for change.** The Open system climate is associated with an external focus and emphasizes on flexibility, growth and innovation (Patterson et al., 2005; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Thus, the Open System climate will probable support a proactive and creative environment. Accordingly, employees perceiving their climate to be dominant in Open System climate might perceive that taking initiative is valued and rewarded. The behavioral component of Organizational Commitment is argued to
be facilitated by individual’s willingness to behave and contribute to a organizations success (O'Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Solinger et al., 2008). On the other hand, the affective and cognitive component of organizational commitment is associated with a supportive work environment and efficient communication with employees (Solinger et al., 2015). The external focus found in Open System climate might not be sufficient in providing a supportive environment. However, in the fast paced and continuously changing environment associated with the open system climate, with an external focus towards the marked, then reflecting upon strategies, objectives and process (Patterson et al., 2005), is likely to be considered important. This suggests that the Open System climate will encourage an environment that values communication, which might in turn facilitate internalization of the organization’s goals and values. Allegedly, it is proposed that Open System climate will support a proactive environment which will allow employees to internalize and behave according to the organization’s goals and values. Thus, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H3c:** There is a positive direct effect between Open System Climate and Organizational Commitment

Based on the hypothesis above, there is also presumed to be an indirect effect between Open System climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment. The following hypothesis is proposed accordingly:

**H4c:** There is a positive indirect effect between Open System Climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment

**Rational goal climate and organizational commitment.** The Rational Goal climate has goals and ends towards productivity and effectivity, which are accomplished through providing employees with clear goals and careful planning (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). Even though this climate type emphasizes on control, and are therefore less flexible, it will be expected to provide employees with a role clarity that subsequently could lead to higher levels of organizational commitment, as illustrated earlier. Furthermore, Patterson, Warr, and West (2004) found that productivity was associated with employee commitment. This might be due to the fact that an effective and external focused organization would lead to higher customer satisfaction, which eventually could promote a feeling of being proud of the organization (affective base of commitment), as working for this organization might be perceived as socially accepted. The Rational Goal climate is often associated with high levels of communication, with comprehensible goals that are carefully planned and communicated to employees. Additionally, in order to enhance employees efficiency and effort, employees will receive continuous performance feedback of job performance (Patterson et al., 2005). One study found that supervisors performance feedback in Police organizations where positively
associated with Organizational Commitment (Johnson, 2015). Moreover, by enhancing employees perception that hard work are rewarded, employees are likely to work harder towards achieving goals (Patterson et al., 2005), thus enhancing the behavioral component of commitment. In brief, Rational Goal climate is presumed to support role clarity, productivity and communication which is argued to facilitate a bond towards the organization. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

**H3d:** There is a positive direct effect between Rational Goal Climate and Organizational Commitment

Based on the hypothesis above, there is also presumed to be a indirect effect between Rational Goal climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment. Following hypothesis is proposed:

**H4d:** There is a positive indirect effect between Rational Goal Climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment
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**Figure 2.** Hypothesized relations between variables

Note. None of the hypothesis related to the indirect effects are displayed but concerns the paths from Human Relation → Organizational Commitment → Readiness for Change (H4a), Internal Process → Organizational Commitment → Readiness for Change (H4b), Open System → Organizational Commitment → Readiness for Change (H4c), and Rational Goal → Organizational Commitment → Readiness for Change (H4d).
Method

This study is part of a collaborative research project between the Norwegian Police University College and the Department of Psychology at the University of Oslo. The Norwegian Police Service is currently undergoing major changes as a result of the new police reform. Hence, the overall project aims to investigate how organizational climate influences employees’ reactions to these changes. This current thesis focus is on whether the Competing Values Framework and Organizational Commitment facilitates employees’ readiness for change. Specifically, whether Organizational Commitment mediates between CVF’s four climate types and Readiness for Change.

Data collection

Data was collected in May 2018, and where distributed to one out of twelve districts in the Norwegian Police Service. The survey was distributed electronically through an online questionnaire, and all participants were fully assured that responses would be handled anonymous and confidentially. They also received an e-mail consisting of information about the project, voluntary participation, and declaration of consent. The survey consisted of 146 items in addition to some demographic information such as gender, age, field and district.

Participants

The survey was distributed to 1005 respondents, differing in age, gender, tenure and area of expertise. Out of these, 216 responses where returned, yielding a response rate of 21.46%. However, due to the fact that the survey was distributed to inactive staff as well (e.g., employees’ on temporary leave or vacation), the genuine response rate is assumed to be higher. Respondents had to answer through an online questionnaire, which resulted in no missing data in the relevant items. The sample consisted of 43.1% female and 56.5% male respondents, 0.4% did not provide gender.

Measures

In this study, constructs of interest have been measured using three scales aimed at measuring: Competing Values Framework, Organizational Commitment and Readiness for change. All questions were asked in Norwegian and is therefore displayed with associated items in that language in Appendix 1. Both the measure for Competing Values Framework and Readiness for Change have been piloted and presented earlier by studies conducted within the Norwegian Police Service. The measure for Organizational Commitment have previously been piloted on Norwegian Healthcare Organizations and presented by Lømo (2017). All negatively worded items have been reversed before preliminary analysis.

Competing Values Framework. Organizational climate was measured using a 29-item scale which is based on Kuenzi (2008) global work climate scale and translated to
Norwegian by Koritzinsky (2015). Eight of these items are resigned to the Human Relation (HR) scale, while both Internal Process (IP), Rational Goal (RG) and Open system (OS) where resigned seven questions respectively. Example items are “There is a high sense of moral among the employees in this unit” (HR), “Rules and procedures are clearly communicated in this unit” (IP), “Changes are well received among members of this unit” (OS), and “It is important for members of this unit to achieve goals” (RG). The scale applies a 5-point Likert scale response format, where 1 is strongly disagree, and 5 represents “strongly agree”.

**Organizational Commitment.** Organizational commitment was measured using a 9-item scale. Lømo (2017) developed the scale aimed to measure Solinger et al.’s (2008) conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. The scale was developed by combining items from two established measures: Affective Commitment Scale (ACS) by Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) by Mowday et al. (1979). The four items taken from ACS was translated to Norwegian by Kuvaas (2006) and five items from OCQ was translated by Stavne (2015). The scale measures Organizational Commitment as a tripartite attitude, where three items are resigned to the affective, cognitive and behavior construct of commitment respectively. According to Solinger et al. (2015) conceptualization of Organizational Commitment, then the three bases (affective, cognitive, and behavioral) should be treated as an overall attitude because each base are presumed to be one part of the theorized attitude towards the organization. Accordingly, all three constructs will be used to measure one latent variable. Example item from this scale are “I really perceive the police’s problem as my own”. The scale applies a 5-point Likert scale response format where 1 represent strongly disagree, and 5 is strongly agree.

**Readiness for change.** Readiness for change was measured using a 7-item scale, where six items originally was developed by Vakola (2014), and later refined and translated to Norwegian by Koritzinsky (2015). The last item was inspired by Holt et al. (2007) and was included to inspect whether self-efficacy is related to Readiness for Change. Example item are “I am sure that I am able to adapt to changes in my unit”. The scale applies a 5-point Likert scale response format, where 1 is strongly disagree and 5 is strongly agree.

**Analysis**

**Preliminary Analysis**

Data screening, preliminary and descriptive analysis were conducted using SPSS 25.0. As the questionnaire where presented online, and all participants had to answer all questions to complete the survey, there were no missing data for any of the indicators. Furthermore, all items where normally distributed, displaying skewness and kurtosis values within acceptable
range. None of the indicators had skewness values above guiding values of unacceptable skewness (>3.0) (Kline, 2011), with most ranging from +/-1, and the largest on -1.29. In addition, none of the indicators displayed kurtosis values above guiding values of problematic kurtosis (>10.0) (Kline, 2011), with most ranging from +/- 1, and the largest with 3.52.

Curve estimation for all the relationship in the model was conducted. As a result, it was determined that all relationships were sufficient linear to be tested in a covariance based structural equation modelling (SEM). Further, to make sure all construct measures were unique, collinearity was tested by inspecting the variance inflation factor (VIF), and by calculating the explained variance ($R^2$) between each exogenous variable in the hypothesized model. No extreme collinearity was found ($R^2 > 0.9$) with highest values on .74. However, there were several VIF values higher than 3, with most ranging from 2-3.4, and highest VIF value on 3.47. This could be a sign of multicollinearity, however still below the recommended threshold of < 10.0 (Kline, 2011).

**Structural Equation Modelling**

The hypothesis where further investigated using structural equation modelling (SEM). Statistically, SEM represent an extension of general linear modelling (Lei & Wu, 2007), and is often described as an combination of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and multiple regression analysis (Schreiber, Nora, Stage, Barlow, & King, 2006). One of the advantages with SEM includes the possibility to estimate various multiple regression models simultaneously, and accordingly provides the option to extend the relationship between latent constructs (Lei & Wu, 2007; Schreiber et al., 2006). Moreover, SEM analysis controls for unique variance in indicators not accounted for by latent construct, as a result it is possible to achieve better estimates for effect sizes between constructs (Kline, 2011). SEM was performed using AMOS 24.0, with maximum likelihood estimation and bootstrap to obtain 95% confidence intervals for the indirect effects.

Since all respected factor constructs are hypothesized theoretically and empirically evaluated rather than derived from collected data, the first step of the analysis was to specify and evaluate the measurement model of latent variables, also known as the CFA (Lei & Wu, 2007; Schreiber et al., 2006). CFA gives the opportunity to examine whether each observed item is suitable for measuring their fixed latent constructs in the theorized model. Moreover, the measurement model is often used to investigate intercorrelation or covariances between latent constructs (Schreiber et al., 2006). In other words, investigating discriminant validity between latent variables (Kline, 2011). Accordingly, this step includes checking factor loadings, modification indices, and investigating covariance between all latent variables (Schreiber et al., 2006). The second step in SEM analysis is to specify the structural model.
This step is described as an extension of multiple regression modelling, and often referred to as causal modelling, in which relations between latent constructs are specified (Lei & Wu, 2007), thus testing the fixed hypotheses.

Once all model parameters have been estimated (both in the measurement model and the structural model), one can use different estimates to evaluate whether the hypothesized theoretical model fits the actually observed data. These estimates is essentially a hypothesis testing tool used to decide whether to retain or reject the model under consideration (Lei & Wu, 2007). Specifically, by evaluating a range of goodness of fit measures it is possible to assess whether the overall proposed model fit the actually observed data (i.e., global fit) (Thoemmes, Rosseel, & Textor, 2018). Goodness of Fit Measures that will be used in this analysis includes Chi-Square, Comparative Fit Index, Root Mean Square Error of Approximation and Standardized Root Mean Residual. In the event that the hypothesized model gets rejected based global fit statistics, then, a local fit approach can help identify potential modifications to ensure a better overall fit (e.g., inspecting the modification indices proposed by AMOS). However, such modification are data-driven and is therefore sensitive to a specific sample (Thoemmes et al., 2018), hence should only be carried out if it is accompanied by theoretical support. Additionally, local fit could also be examined by inspecting standardized covariance residual. Standardized covariance residuals displays differences in observed and predicted covariances (Kline, 2011), and standardized residuals exceeding +/- 4.0 should be inspected as this may suggest a serious problem (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2019; Kline, 2011).

**Goodness of fit.** Chi-Square ($\chi^2$), is the traditional measure for evaluating overall model fit, and evaluates the magnitude of discrepancy between the sample covariance matrix and the covariance matrix implied by the specified model (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008; Lei & Wu, 2007). If the data fits the model, this would provide a non-significant Chi-Square (p>.05) (Hooper et al., 2008). However, a limitation with this test is that it has statistically been found to be extremely sensitive to large sample size. Consequently, a model that fits the data could be rejected due to large sample size (Lei & Wu, 2007). Due to the sample size in this study (N = 216), a significant Chi-square is expected, and other goodness of fit measures will therefore be included to ensure a good model fit.

The comparative fit index (CFI) is an incremental fit indices, and is used as an indication of how well the observed data fits the hypothesized model compared with the null model, which assumes no correlation among latent variables (Hooper et al., 2008; Kline, 2011). This measure is a good supplement for the chi-square since it adjust the effect of sample size (Hooper et al., 2008; Lei & Wu, 2007). The CFI index ranges from 0-1, where
values closer to 1 indicates good fit (Hooper et al., 2008), thus values above .90 are generally accepted as indications of good model fit (Hooper et al., 2008; Lei & Wu, 2007).

Furthermore, both Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) and Standardized Root Mean Residual (SRMR) are absolute fit indices. Hence, these measures estimate whether the proposed theory fits the data. Unlike incremental fit indices, these measures do not rely on comparison with a null model, but rather estimates how well the data fits the model compared to no model at all (Hooper et al., 2008). RMSEA and SRMR are scaled as an badness-of-fit for the specified model, where values approaching zero indicates the best model fit (Kline, 2011). However, these measures are sensitive to number of estimated parameters in the model, therefore, the recommended criteria for good model fit is set to RMSEA < .6 and SRMR < .8 (Hooper et al., 2008; Lei & Wu, 2007).

**Heywood cases.** Like any other multivariate techniques, when conducting SEM analysis the user need to be cautious about results that seem implausible (Hair et al., 2019). This is most evident by SEM presenting parameter estimate with illogical values (Kline, 2011). For instance if correlation estimates (standardized estimates) between constructs or standardized path coefficients exceeds +/- 1.0 (Hair et al., 2019). Such results are theoretical impossible, and often referred to as Heywood cases (Hair et al., 2019; Kline, 2011). Moreover, these issues may occur as a result of highly correlated constructs in the model (poor discriminant validity), or even from poorly specified constructs presented by low reliability or poor construct validity (Hair et al., 2019).

**Reliability and Validity.** In the process of verifying the measurement model, one objective is to determine construct validity of the proposed model. Construct validity reflects the extent to which a set of observed items accurately reflects the theoretical latent construct. This is resolved by examining convergent validity, factor loadings and discriminant validity between latent constructs (Hair et al., 2019). Convergent validity indicates whether all observed variables of one latent variable intercorrelation is at least moderate (Kline, 2011). In other words, whether the latent variable is well explained by the presented items. Average variance extracted (AVE) measures convergent validity, where values above the recommended threshold (> .5) indicates high convergent validity. Furthermore, factor loadings should be considered important in order to verify convergent validity. A rule of thumb is that all factor loadings should be statistically significant, and standardized factor loading should exceed .5 (Hair et al., 2019).

High discriminant validity, indicates that intercorrelation between a number of observed variables presumed to measure different factors are high (Kline, 2011). In other words, discriminant validity indicates whether observed variables correlate highly with items
outside their respected factor. As a result, this measure provides evidence whether or not a construct is unique compared to other constructs in the theorized model (Hair et al., 2019). This is evident by highly standardized correlated estimates between latent constructs.

Composite reliability (CR), is often used in conjunction with SEM analysis in order to validate constructs convergent validity (Hair et al., 2019). CR is explained as the ratio of explained variance divided by the total variance. CR above .70 is considered a good reliability, while above .80 is “very good”, and above .90 is considered “excellent” reliability (Kline, 2011).

**Sample size**

Several researchers have suggested different recommendations regarding sample size when maximum likelihood is used in SEM analysis. Some have argued that a sample size of 10 observations per estimated parameter (Hair et al., 2019), while others have argued that 5 observations per estimated parameter is enough in order to get statistical significant results (Bentler & Chou, 1987). However, Kline (2011) argued that an absolute value of N > 200, is appropriate for conducting SEM-analysis. In this study, N = 216, which means that this sample size is sufficient to conduct SEM-analysis.

**Ethical considerations**

This project is approved by the Norwegian Center for Research Data (NSD). All participants were informed by the purpose of the study, management of collected data and that no individual responses would be disclosed. Participation was further voluntary, and all participants had the opportunity to withdraw their participation at any time of the study. All collected data was stored in accordance with established safety routines for sensitive data at the University of Oslo.

**Results**

**Preliminary analysis**

The means, standard deviations, Cronbach’s alpha and inter-correlations between sum scores of every construct are presented in Table 1. The results displayed high correlations between all CVF constructs, however Readiness for Change and Organizational Commitment displayed considerably lower correlations. All construct displayed higher means than the midpoint of the five-point scale (3), indicating a positive degree of readiness for change, organizational commitment and all CVF constructs in the sample.
Table 1
Mean (M), Standard Deviation (SD), Cronbach’s Alpha (α) and Zero-Order Correlations for all Constructs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Human Relations</td>
<td>3.847</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal Process</td>
<td>3.680</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.792**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Open Systems</td>
<td>3.757</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>0.774**</td>
<td>0.761**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rational Goal</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>0.688</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.745**</td>
<td>0.783**</td>
<td>0.785**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organizational commitment</td>
<td>3.476</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.382**</td>
<td>0.334**</td>
<td>0.325**</td>
<td>0.474**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Readiness for Change</td>
<td>3.776</td>
<td>0.587</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.265**</td>
<td>0.262**</td>
<td>0.363**</td>
<td>0.404**</td>
<td>0.501**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note N=216

**Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

All constructs internal consistency reliability, or often referred to as Cronbach’s alpha (Kline, 2011), were all above .80, indicating a very good reliability for all constructs (Kline, 2011, s. 70). Note that the conducted regression analysis displayed a possibility to increase Cronbach’s Alpha in the Organizational Commitment scale by excluding two items, specifically COM6 (α if item deleted = .822) and COM8 (α if item deleted = .813). However, the reliability of this scale was considered high without exclusion of these items, thus, the scale was considered sufficient for further testing in Structural Equation Modelling.

**Structural Equation Modeling**

**Measurement model.** The first Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) contained all items accompanying their respected latent factors and is displayed in Appendix 2. However, this model did not meet all criteria for a good model fit, as displayed in Table 2. The Chi-square was significant, as expected due to the sample size and number of indicators. Furthermore, both CFI and RMSEA indicated poor model fit, while the SRMR value yielded acceptable fit. In addition, the model displayed low convergent validity in both OC, HR and RC as well as discriminant validity between all climate factors. As a consequence, several changes were made to the model in order to achieve higher validity and increase model fit. These modifications were made one by one in order to keep track of improvements in the model.

First step was to examine all items that displayed low factor loadings to the Organizational Commitment scale, in order to increase convergent validity. Three items displayed factor loadings under the recommended threshold (> .5), namely COM1, COM6 and COM8. COM6 “I’m not “emotionally attached” to the police” and COM8 “I would accept almost any work assignment as long as I continued to work for the police”. The wording of these questions evoked theoretical questions about whether they actually measure the intended construct, as the wording might be perceived speculative and vague. These two
items factor loadings were considerable low to their respected latent variable (<.32), and both questions showed some implications on the construct’s internal consistent reliability in the preliminary analysis. Thus, both these items were excluded from further analysis. Similarly, COM1 “I find that my values and the police’s values are very similar” had factor loading below the recommended threshold (> .5) at .45 and were therefore excluded from further analysis. All three questions measured cognition, affect and behavior respectively. However, AVE were still below the recommended cut-off of .50 (AVE=.49, see Table 3). This indicated that there is more error variance than explained variance for this latent construct. Nevertheless, AVE above .40 can still be acceptable for further analysis given that the construct’s composite reliability (CR) is high (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The CR for Organizational Commitment was .85, which is considered good reliability. Allegedly, it was decided to not compute more modifications to this scale in order to ensure content validity.

Second step was to examine low factor loadings to Readiness for Change, in order to increase the latent variables convergent validity. One item, CHA4 “I think I’m more ready to accept change than my colleagues in my unit”, loaded below the recommended threshold at .5 (factor loading = .44). While the other questions in this scale asks the respondent to evaluate their own beliefs and attitudes towards change, CHA4 asks the respondent to compare themselves to other members of the unit and were therefore considered conceptually different from the other questions. Employees high on Readiness for Change should believe in their own as well as their co-workers ability to successfully manage change (Vakola, 2014), however this does not necessarily entails that they should feel “more ready” compared to other members in the department. In addition, the item showed several high standardized covariance residuals (>3), indicating that this item might pose problems to the local fit. Consequently, it was decided to exclude this item from further analysis, which resulted in increased AVE (convergent validity) for this latent construct.

In the next phase, some error terms fixed to items of the same latent variable were allowed to covary as suggested by the modification indices in AMOS. However, these alterations were later reversed due to several Haywood cases in the structural model. This structural model is displayed in Appendix 3. As can be seen, the structural model displayed various regression weights between latent variables above 1.0, which is theoretically impossible. These results indicated that there were problems with multicollinearity within this model. The latent constructs of the four CVF climates displayed high covariances (ranging from .81 - .93), indicating discriminant validity issues in this model (i.e. items within each of these constructs correlated highly with items outside their respected factor). This issue was
resolved by going back to the second step of the analysis and examine discriminant validity between all climate types.

To increase discriminant validity, displayed by covariance above .8 between all CVF’s climate constructs, it was decided to perform several exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in SPSS 25.0 between those factors displaying high covariances, these are displayed in Appendix 4. This was done in order to identify items with high cross loadings. As Internal Process appeared to covary above (.9) between both Human Relation and Rational Goal, it was decided to start with this latent variable. Three items, both IP5, IP6, and IP7, displayed concerning cross loading to both Human Relation, Rational Goal and Open System, and were therefore excluded from further analysis. IP5 and IP7 were considered similar in wording, and all three items concerned the results instead of procedures within the unit. As climate is thought to be reflected in procedures (Kuenzi, 2008), it was decided that exclusion of these items did not affect content validity of this latent variable.

EFA between Human Relation and the other latent variables in the CVF displayed concerning loadings of HR7 and HR8. These questions extracted a third factor in the EFA between Human Relation and both Internal Process and Open System. In addition to high loadings to Rational Goal climate. Moreover, HR8 showed multiple high standardized residual covariances (absolute value above 3). Both these questions where similar in wording, HR7 “All employees have the opportunity to develop their skills” and HR8 “All employees have the opportunity to develop their professional skills”. Compared to the other questions fixed to the Human Relation scale, these questions stand out because other items use phrases such as “we in this unit”. Given that climate is theoretically defined as employees “shared perceptions of procedures”, then phrases such as “all employees” might not truly measure employees shared perception. In addition, it is also possible that this question is more related to norms within the organization, rather than procedures and practices, and is therefore more related to organizational culture rather than climate. This might be part of explaining why these items extracted a third factor. Accordingly, these items were excluded from the human relation scale.

One item from Open System were also excluded, namely OS7 “We are encouraged to find new solutions to problems in this unit”. This item displayed high factor loading to the all other constructs in the EFA. Additionally, all the other questions in the Open System scale concern employees’ readies and adaptability, while OS7 is the only question relation to whether the organization encourage innovative behavior. Exclusion of this question were therefore decided to not decrease the latent construct content validity.
Lastly, RG5 “*We get rewards for achieving goals in this unit*”, opposed some problems by displaying high factor loadings to the extracted factor for Internal Process. Furthermore, RG7 had several standardized residual covariances above 2.4, in addition to displaying cross loadings with the Internal Process scale. Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) argued that among the four quadrants, then Internal Process and Rational Goal is considered to be most similar to each other. This indicated that these two climates are presumed to correlate the highest, making the cross-loadings less surprising. Moreover, RG3 “*it is important that we plan for the future*” displayed cross loadings between both the factor extracted for Open System and Rational Goal. This also makes sense as this question aims to measure these climates shared value of external focus. However, each of these questions opposed problems in the measurement model. As they aim to measure this climates emphasis on goal-setting and responsiveness to external demands respectively, and these focuses are already covered from the remaining items, it was considered that exclusion of these items will not disrupt content validity of this scale. Other items in the Rational Goal variable did raise some concern due to cross loadings in the EFA, namely RG2 and RG4, however it was decided to keep these items to maintain content validity in the latent variable. These cross loadings were also not as severe as the cross-loadings displayed in the excluded items in this latent variable.

Table 2
*Measurement model Goodness of Fit statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1883.27**</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>2.025</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.0729</td>
<td>All items included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>721.89**</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.0610</td>
<td>Items; COM1, COM6, COM8, HR7, HR8, IP5, IP6, IP7, OS7, RG3, RG4, RG7, CHA4 are excluded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Chi-square significant at the .000 level  
1 90% Confidence interval of RMSEA

All these changes resulted in improvements in both convergent validity of HR, and discriminant validity between the latent variables in CVF. However, the measurement model still displayed high covariance between HR and IP (.81) as well as between RG and IP (.83), which is not ideal as this indicates that there iss still some discriminant validity issues between those latent variables. In order to maintain content validity within the scales and be
able to test the entire CVF, it was decided to not do any further modification of the scale. Furthermore, discriminant validity issues should be recognized as a limitation of the proposed model. Nevertheless, model fit measures were within an acceptable range after these alterations, as displayed in Table 2.

Composite reliability (CR) was above .85 for all latent variables, indicating a good reliability for all construct after all modifications that was made above. Convergent validity (AVE) were considered adequate for further analysis. It should be acknowledged that Organizational Commitment displayed AVE at .49, thus below the recommended threshold (> .5), however as previously deliberated, this scale displayed good composite reliability. According to Fornell and Larcker (1981) recommendation for determining construct validity, it was decided that the scale had adequate validity for conducting further analysis. The final measurement model is displayed in Appendix 5.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relation</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Process</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open System</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Goal</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. CR = Composite Reliability, AVE = Average variance extracted

**Structural model.** Having demonstrated acceptable fit for the measurement model, the next step was to introduce the paths between all latent variables. In other words testing the specified hypotheses in a structural model. The initial structural model displayed some insignificant regression weights approaching zero, specifically the path between both Internal Process Climate and Rational Goal climate to Readiness for Change. These paths may represent noise in the model, thus interferes with the contributions from the remaining constructs by limiting their explanatory power, as expected from Structural Equation models. However, by controlling for these contributions (i.e. constraining to zero) then the number of estimated parameters is reduced. This is consistent with the parsimony principle, which entails that a model with fewer parameters is preferred given similar fit to the same data (Kline, 2011). This is because fewer parameters will increase the model’s degrees of freedom and eventually increase the possibility of retaining a model. The final Structural model is
displayed in Figure 3, were standardized regression coefficients (β) between latent variables, factor loadings between latent variables and items and correlation between all exogenous variables are displayed.

Figure 3. Structural Model Path Diagram

Note. Displaying standardized coefficients.

HR= Human Relation, IP= Internal Process, OS= Open System, RG= Rational Goal, COM= Organizational Commitment, CHA= Readiness for Change. Circles represent unobserved variables and rectangles represent observed variables. The circles displaying e** denotes error variance in each observed variable, while circles displaying d** denotes disturbance terms.

It should be mentioned that ad-hoc tests for a possible second-order factor was conducted in order to explore whether a general factor explained all the covariation among the first order factors in the CVF. However, this model was rejected do to inferior model fit statistics, indicating that the second order factor model did not explain the observed data better than the original model. Additionally, the model had poorer explanatory power of the
endogenous variables in the model, displayed by inferior R². The second order factor model is displayed in Appendix 6. Accordingly, the original model was retained.

Table 3 displays Goodness of fit indices for two structural models before and after the regression weights between Rational Goal climate and Internal Process climate to Readiness for Change was constrained to zero. Both models show good model fit, and only Chi-Square and Degrees of Freedom were affected by controlling for these regression weights.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA [CI]</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>721.89**</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.0610</td>
<td>Regression weights between RG-CHA and IP-CHA are constrained to zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>721.98**</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1.601</td>
<td>.929</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.0610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items; COM1, COM6, COM8, HR7, HR8, IP5, IP6, IP7, OS7, RG3, RG4, RG7, CHA4 are excluded
** Chi-square significant at the .000 level
1 90% Confidence interval of RMSEA

Direct, indirect and total effects

The final results, with direct, indirect and total effects are displayed in Table 4. The final analysis showed a significant direct effect between both Human Relation climate (β = -.26) and Open System climate (β = .49) to Readiness for change. However, since both paths were hypothesized to be positive, it resulted in only the hypothesis concerning Open System climate to be retained (H1c). Both hypothesis concerning the direct effect between Internal Process climate and Rational Goal climate to Readiness for Change was eventually rejected due to insignificant results (hypothesis H1b and H1d respectively).

Moreover, the result of the present study indicated a positive relationship between Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change (β = .58), which resulted in hypothesis H2 to be retained. Furthermore, the analysis supported hypothesis H3d by displaying a positive direct effect between Rational Goal climate and Organizational Commitment (β = .49). Neither Human Relation climate, Internal Process climate, nor Open System climate significantly predicted Organizational Commitment, thus rejecting hypothesis H3a, H3b and H3c respectively.
### Table 4

*Estimates of Direct, Indirect and Total Effects between Latent Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal Variables</th>
<th>Endogenous Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Relation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (by OC)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (by OC)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (by OC)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect (by OC)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* OC = Organizational Commitment. 95% CI = confidence intervals for unstandardized coefficients. SE = Standard error for unstandardized coefficients. Displaying unstandardized coefficients: b and standardized coefficients: β.

*Coefficient significant at .05 level

**Coefficient significant at .001

Following R. M. Baron and Kenny (1986) steps for establishing possible mediating relationships, then Organizational Commitment could not mediate between neither Human Relation climate, Internal Process climate nor Open System climate to Readiness for Change due to insignificant direct relationship to the mediating variable. Thus, rejecting hypothesis H4a, H4b, and H4c. However, Rational Goal climate did significantly predict Organizational Commitment. Additionally, as previously accounted for, Organizational Commitment predicted Readiness for Change significantly. Consequently, all conditions for a mediation
effect of Rational Goal climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment was met. Recall that the direct effect between Rational Goal climate and Readiness for Change was approaching zero and not significant in the model. However, as the model accounts for the mediating variable, this is explained by Organizational Commitment fully mediating between these variables according to R. M. Baron and Kenny (1986). Thus, the hypothesis concerning the indirect relationship between Rational Goal climate and Readiness for Change through Organizational Commitment (hypothesis H4d) was retained.

Discussion

The overall aim of this study was to explore the relationship between Organizational Climate, Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change. The study was conducted in the Norwegian Police, which is currently undergoing major structural changes. Specifically, the thesis investigated whether Organizational Commitment and the four CVF climate (i.e. Human Relation, Internal Process, Open system and Rational goal) could predict employee’s Readiness for Change directly and whether the four climate dimensions could predict Readiness for Change indirectly through Organizational Commitment. Thirteen hypotheses where derived and presented in Structural Equation Modeling.

According to the literature, Human Relation Climate was expected to stimulate a supportive environment, flexible work procedures and increased employee skills, which in turn have been demonstrated to predict Readiness for Change (e.g., Hanpachern et al., 1998; Jones et al., 2005; Oreg et al., 2011). Nevertheless, the result of the present study is inconsistent with these presumptions. In fact, the result indicated a negative relationship between Human Relation climate and Readiness for Change. Suggesting that a climate characterized by the emphasis on systematic development of human resources, cooperation and a supportive environment, will negatively influence how employees encounter organizational change. These findings could be explained by this climate internal focus. This climate is likely to perceive external marked demands as insignificant to the organization’s success, which could prevent opportunities for creating a discrepancy as defined by Armenakis et al. (1993). In fact, Armenakis and Harris (2002) argued that discrepancy is best demonstrated by enlightening external marked demands. Then, a forced upon change targeting external demands can be perceived as conflicting with established values in order to be internally focused, which might result in a decreased acceptance of a particular change. However, it cannot be ruled out that this negative relationship might be a result of the exclusion of two items within the scale. These items aimed to measure this climate’s emphasis on training. These items were excluded due to discriminant validity-, as well as content validity concerns. As development of human resources was argued to support
employees’ confidence to succeeding in change (efficacy), then exclusion of these items might have affected the results.

In accordance with the hypothesis, the analysis revealed that Open System climate was positively associated with Readiness for Change. This result suggests that Open System climate, characterized by a flexible work structure, support for innovative ideas and procedures of meeting external marked demands, might support employees’ confidence to succeeding in change. This indicated relationship supports already exciting research suggesting that flexible work policies are positively associated with higher levels of Readiness for Change (Eby et al., 2000; Jones et al., 2005). However, Human Relation Climate, also characterized by flexible work procedures, displayed a negative relationship to Readiness for Change. For the time being, this suggests that the positive relationship between flexibility and support for change depends on other aspects of climate. The dependent variable might be the Open System climates emphasis on resource acquisition. Employees perceiving that the organization provides them with enough resources in times of change, might be more confident on the organizations ability to manage change processes, thereby improving their principal support towards change. Additionally, Open System Climate and Readiness for change makes theoretical sense as this climate is assumed to stimulate responsiveness to external requirements, resulting in employees’ being aware of the need for change.

Another interesting finding was the undetected relationship between Internal Process climate and Readiness for Change. This result suggests that practices and procedures associated with Internal Process climate (e.g., strictly following established rules and procedures) is not associated with employee’s Readiness for Change. The initial hypothesis claimed that this climate’s internal focus would lead to the inability to communicate why change is needed, thus not supporting employees beliefs towards change as proposed by Armenakis and Harris (2002). Another explanation could be that this climate supports routines through formalization and stability, which might limit the employee’s opportunities to engage in upcoming change initiatives. In other word, procedures that inhibit employees’ interactions with change procedures, might not be appropriate in order to predict Readiness for Change. However, the undetected relationship could also be caused by multicollinearity. In other words, the intercorrelation between CVF’s climate types might result in the unique contributions of the three remaining climates limiting the explanatory power of Internal Process climate.

As predicted, Organizational Commitment was positively associated with Readiness for Change. This indicate that employees accept, embrace and adopt a particular change when they consider the organization’s values and goals as favorable. The result is in line with
previous researchers suggesting that Organizational Commitment supports positive attitudes towards change (e.g., Madsen et al., 2005; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). The theory of commitment implies that a highly committed employee will strive on behalf of the organization, even when such behavior might conflict with individual’s best interest (Judge et al., 2017; Oreg et al., 2011). These results support this by suggesting that highly committed individuals will maintain an effort towards the organizational goals, even in large-scale changes.

Surprisingly, neither Human Relation climate, Open System climate, nor Internal Process climate where significantly associated with Organizational Commitment. These results were inconsistent with the presumption of the present study. Dimensions within each of these climate types have previously indicated to positively predict Organizational Commitment. First of all, as previously discussed, the exclusion of two items in the Human Relation climate, resulted in the scale not accounting for the Human Relation climate’s emphasis on training. As it was initially argued that securing individual’s long term goals through Human Resource development would support Organizational Commitment, it might be that exclusion of these items have misrepresented the true explanatory power of Human Relation Climate on Organizational Commitment. However, other emphasis argued to be important facilitators of commitment is still represented in the scale (e.g., cohesion and cooperation). Similarly, exclusion of three items in the Internal Process climate might have implicated the results. These items were excluded due to discriminant validity concerns. Moreover, they aimed to measure Internal Process climate’s emphasis on productivity and quality, which have been found to be positively associated with Organizational Commitment (Patterson et al., 2004). Therefore, exclusion of these items might have limited the explanatory power between Internal Process Climate and Organizational Commitment.

Another explanation for the non-significant relationship between both Human Relation climate and Internal Process climate on Organizational Commitment, might be described to these climates’ internal focus. As the police is consistently working towards the society, in order to promote and consolidate citizen’s security and general welfare (NOU2017:09, 2017), a general assumption might be that the police is “fundamentally” externally focused. As Organizational Commitment is described as employee’s internalization of organizational goals and values, one assumption can be that employee’s will adopt values and goals that are externally oriented. Employees shared perception of practices that are assumed to facilitate these goals might accordingly promote Organizational Commitment.

The non-significant relationship between Open System Climate and Organizational Commitment might be due to inadequate communication among employees. Communication
is claimed to be one of the main facilitators of Organizational Commitment (Solinger et al., 2008). As this climate is suggested to value constant readiness and adaptability, planning- and goal-setting might be a non-priority. Internalization of the organization’s goals might therefore not be associated with the practices that Open System Climate is argued to facilitate.

As predicted, the result of this study illustrated a positive relationship between Rational Goal climate and Organizational Commitment. Furthermore, the result indicated that the effect of Rational Goal and Readiness for Change was fully mediated by Organizational Commitment. This indicates that organizations with strong Rational Goal values will promote employees’ organizational commitment, which again will facilitate employees Readiness for Change. At the time being, this supports that performance feedback might be an important predictor of Police Officer’s Organizational Commitment (Johnson, 2015). Given that Rational Goal climate is associated with enhanced investigation performance in the Norwegian Police (Lone et al., 2017), this tentatively supports previous researchers indicating that productivity promotes employees Organizational Commitment (Patterson et al., 2004).

Additionally, as this climate is externally oriented, another explanation might be that Police Officer’s perceive practices associated with Rational Goal Climate as important for promoting the Police’s inherent mission in society.

**Implications**

**Implications for Research and Theory.** Overall, this study contributes to expansion of the operational, conceptual and theoretical understanding of CVF’s global climates, Organizational Commitment, and Readiness for Change.

**Competing Values Framework.** The results of this study revealed a high inter-correlation between the four global climate types, as predicted based on similar findings from previous research (e.g., Kuenzi, 2008). Nevertheless, in this particular study these highly correlated climate types caused multicollinearity issues in the initial structural model, which resulted in exclusion of 2 items in both the Human relation scale and Open system scale, as well as 3 items in both the Internal Process scale and Rational goal scale. It should be recognized that the removal of these items might have some implications for the results presented in this thesis. However, all excluded items where theoretically reasoned to not reduce content validity in neither of the climate scales.

Despite several items being excluded from the analysis, the final structural model did display high correlation between all climate types (displayed with covariances ranging from 62-81), signifying discriminant validity issues in the presented model. Grewal, Cote, and Baumgartner (2004) suggested that discriminant validity issues, could possibly lead to Type 2 error, which ultimately derive misleading conclusions from the data (e.g., ascribe wrong sign
or even effect size to a variable). On the other side, Type 2 error is less likely when the constructs display high CR, consistent with the present study where all constructs displayed CR above .85. Regardless, the result of this study should be interpreted carefully, as discriminant validity issues could have caused misrepresentation of the results. Hence, further investigation and development of these scales is warranted in order to resolve discriminant- as well as convergent validity issues within these scales.

According to the original theory of CVF, which entails that climate assembling similar focus or structure are expected to be positively correlated (e.g., Internal Process climate and Rational Goal climate). Whereas climates that have contrasting emphasis, are presumed to be weakly or negatively correlated (e.g., Human Relation climate and Rational Goal climate) (Quinn & McGrath, 1982). Conversely, the findings of the present study failed to support this anticipated pattern of interrelations between the four climate types. This is evident by the four climates displaying high intercorrelations, even between the opposing climates. Furthermore, as the theory of CVF embodies competing values (Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983), one dominant belief is that organizations should exhibit a dominant climate type. However, as the four climates displayed high intercorrelations, and only Human Relation climate demonstrated a slightly larger mean compared to the other climates, the presumption of a dominant climate type is not supported by the present study. These findings can be interpreted as the four climates to be complimentary, rather than competing as suggested by the original theory. The findings support recent research indicating that CVF quadrants highly correlates (e.g., Hartnell et al., 2011; Koritzinsky, 2015; Kuenzi, 2008).

Furthermore, these findings raise question on whether there is a second order factor of the four climate types, one that suggests a general factor of global climate. In the present study, there was not predicted to be a second order factor, as organizations are not presumed to value each of the climate types equally (Patterson et al., 2005). In other words, a general factor would likely misrepresent the model. However, due to the large correlation between the four global climates, ad-hoc tests for a second-order factor was conducted in order to account for the shared variance between the four climates. The second order structural model, as can be seen in Appendix 4, displayed both inferior Goodness of Fit statistics and displayed less explanatory power (explained variance (R²)) on both Readiness for Change and Organizational Commitment. As a result, there were no evidence suggesting that a second order factor would be better fit to represent the data.

Supporting this, Kuenzi (2008) argued that the four global climates could be at odds with each other, and essentially cancel themselves out with a higher order factor. That is to say that, by representing the model with a general global climate, one would likely
misrepresent the organizational climate. For instance, in the present study it was evident that Human Relation climate, Open System climate and Rational Goal climate differentially predicted Readiness for Change. They even had opposing effects on the outcome variable. The fact that each of the climates predicted outcome variables differentially, supports the indication of them being independent constructs (Kuenzi, 2008), even though they are highly correlated. Conversely, by constraining these to a higher order factor, the results would have misrepresented how each of the climates emphasis and values relates to outcome variables.

The high intercorrelation between the four CVF climates might have been difficult to detect in previous research due to the majority of research assessing the framework using ipsative response format (forced choice questionnaire) (e.g., Colley et al., 2013). This raises questions on whether it is appropriate to measure the CVF using normative scales, as equivalent with the present study. A normative scale might be inappropriate for representing the inherent conflicts found in the CVF. However, by using an ipsative response format researchers would “force” the organization to be represented by a dominant climate type. Hartnell et al. (2011) argued that the existence of a dominant climate does not automatically prevent the presence of another. Thus, not accounting for the occurrence of these other climates might lead to misrepresenting the organizations climate. Consequently, a normative response format is suggested to be beneficial in order to measure the absolute score of organizational climates.

**Organizational Commitment.** This study used a scale aimed to measure Solinger et al. (2008) conceptualization of Organizational Commitment. Three components of commitment (affective, cognitive and behavioral) was treated as an overall attitude, thus measured as one latent variable based upon recommendations by Solinger et al. (2015). The scale showed good reliability, indicating that the scale is suitable to measure Organizational Commitment as an overall attitude. However, three items were excluded in the CFA due to convergent validity concerns. These items measured the cognitive, behavioral and affective component of commitment respectively. It should be recognized that exclusion of these items may have some theoretical implications on the result presented in this thesis. However, they were all theoretically assessed prior to exclusion, and it was concluded that exclusion of these variables would not limit the content validity of the scale. Nevertheless, further testing and modification of the scale is recommended in order to increase convergent validity in future research.

The literature on organizational change have been conflicting regarding whether or not organizational commitment facilitates positive attitudes toward change. Some researchers have argued that committed employees’ might be motivated to preserve things as they are,
because already established ways are associated with positive feelings towards the organization (Judge et al., 2017). Others have argued that highly committed employees’ will be more willing to accept and embrace new change initiatives (Madsen et al., 2005; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). The result of this thesis supports the latter, implying that committed employees’ are likely to display positive attitudes towards organizational change. This might be explained by the fact that organizational commitment reduces change related stress (see Begley et al., 1993), resulting in less negative associations towards organizational change, which ultimately makes it easier for employees’ to support new change initiatives.

Additionally, highly committed employees might be willing to accept new change initiatives because they identify with the organization’s goals and values. Accordingly, if changes are perceived relevant for achieving these goals, then individuals might be more prone to see the immediate need for change. These results contribute to the theory of commitment by extending our knowledge regarding which organizational context where commitment is likely to be deemed important.

The findings of the present study indicate that when accounting for all global-climates in the Norwegian Police, then organizational commitment is facilitated through Rational Goal climate. Taken together with the fact that Rational Goal climate have been suggested to be salient in predicting investigation performance in the Norwegian Police (Lone et al., 2017), this tentatively suggest that facilitating commitment through organizational climate might depend on how practices within these climates aligns with the perceived overall goals and values of the organization. This would support the notion that highly committed employees identify with organizations goals and values (Judge & Kammeyer Mueller, 2012), thus practices that are presumed to promote these goals facilitates Organizational Commitment. As previously argued, the Police might essentially be externally oriented. Therefore, even though each of the CVF climate types are salient in the Norwegian Police (as indicated by the result of the present study), climates that are assumed to promote the Police’s external orientation might be more prominent for employee’s Organizational Commitment. Additionally, as Organizational Commitment is argued to develop over time as a result of interactions at work (Judge et al., 2017), employees are more likely to identify with goals that are presumed to be achieved by their day-to-day work tasks. All units in the Norwegian Police have clearly defined key performance indicators that are reported to the police’s management tool (PSV). These key performance indicators are likely to be reflected in employee’s everyday work tasks, and these goals might accordingly be perceived as more salient. Thus, resembling a Rational Goal climate which is associated with clearly defined goals, performance feedback and productivity.
**Readiness for Change.** The scale aimed to measure Readiness for Change displayed high reliability. However, one item was removed due to low factor loadings to the respected latent variable. It should be recognized that the removal of this item could be of significance for the interpretation of the result in this study. However, the item was theoretically examined prior to exclusion, and it was argued that the exclusion of this item would not limit the scale’s content validity. However, further testing and development of this scale is warranted.

Since organizational changes frequently ends in unsuccessful implementations (Beer & Nohria, 2000), researchers have been eager to suggest valuable approaches towards change (e.g., Burnes, 2004; Burnes & Jackson, 2011). However, recent researchers have suggested that most unsuccessful implementation is caused by not accounting for the organizations values and procedures (Gundhus, 2017; Yilmaz, 2013). Suggesting that a selected approach towards change should be tailored in order to align with practices that supports employee’s attitudes and beliefs towards change. Furthermore, many studies have supported that Readiness for Change is a major influence on successful implementations. Accordingly, the present study supports the notion that accounting for organizational climate is noticeably important in times of change. This is clearly evident by the result of this study suggesting that global climate can predict Readiness for Change.

Furthermore, one of the main implications of the present study is the noteworthy findings regarding how different climate facilitates Readiness for Change, specifically how they had contrasting effects on the outcome variable. The findings concerning Human Relation climate’s negative influence on employee’s Readiness for Change was unexpected, as human relation values have been previously suggested to predict Readiness for Change (e.g., Jones et al., 2005). However, as these results contradicts previous findings, it might be interpreted as the result being restricted to the Norwegian Police. Additionally, a relationship between Internal Process climate and Readiness for change was not detected by the results of this study. However, it cannot be ruled out that the undetected relationship is the result of multicollinearity between the four CVF’s climate types. In other words, the unique contribution of the three remaining climates might have obstructed the explanatory power of Internal Process climate. Adding to this, Open System climate was positively related to Readiness for Change, and Organizational Commitment fully mediated this relationship. In sum, these results implicate that the organizational climate’s influence on Readiness for Change is complex, thus further research is needed in order to establish how climate facilitates positive beliefs and attitudes towards organizational change.

**Implications for Practice.** Supported by the result of the present study, there are some practical implications to be made. First and foremost, prior to change initiatives, the
focus should be on identifying the right approach to facilitate Readiness for Change relative to a specific Organization. Former research has supported that emphasis on training and internal communication (suggested to be supported by Human Relation climate) will create positive attitudes towards change. However, the result of the present study suggest that this is not the case for the Norwegian Police, as these practices would likely decrease the possibility of employees’ accepting change. In other words, Human Relation procedures may not be appropriate to this specific context (i.e. change) in the Police organization. Still, it is important to note that Human Relation climate have previously been found to predict investigation performance in the Norwegian Police (Lone et al., 2017). Hence, the present study does not imply that Human Relation climate is irrelevant to the Norwegian Police, rather that these practices is unfitting for a change context. The results indicate that practices and procedures associated with both Open System climate and Rational Goal climate will be beneficial to enhance in times of change. However, this might be restricted to the Norwegian Police, thus not valid for all organizations, as the result of this study indicated that facilitators to Readiness for Change does not necessarily rely on specific contextual factors that could be applied for all organizations, but it varies in accordance to the particular organizations’ nature.

Secondly, the present study entails some implications to be made by the Norwegian Police organization. The results suggest that Open System climate stimulates positive attitudes towards organizational change, probably by ensuring that Police Officers are adequately resourced and being responsive to external demands. Accordingly, management should focus on maintaining these practices, as meeting external demands and welcoming innovative thinking will probably increase Police Officers general principal support towards organizational change.

Third, one of the main contributions of this study was demonstrating that Organizational Commitment was positively associated with Readiness for Change. Previous research has supported that Organizational Commitment promotes outcomes like organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction and turnover (Ilies et al., 2009; Judge et al., 2001; Porter et al., 1974), which all are deemed important for most organizations. These results add to previous findings and extends our understanding of how important it is for management to ensure that employees are highly committed. However, Organizational Commitment is defined in terms of an attitude, indicating that commitment emerges over time. This implies that management cannot unexpectedly begin to promote Organizational Committed, rather this should be an extended focus. Furthermore, in a growing marked where
organizations rapidly have to change, then organizations with highly committed employees would be expected to facilitate employees that are ready for change.

Lastly, there are some managerial implications specifically directed towards the Norwegian Police organization related to the result of this study. Climate did not relate to Organizational Commitment as anticipated. These findings were probably a result of the Norwegian Police distinctiveness. That is to say that climate will probably facilitate organizational commitment differently depending upon the organization’s uniqueness. Particularly important for facilitating commitment in Police Officers was Rational Goal climate, probably by allowing employees’ to be externally oriented, productive and efficient. Management should therefore focus on preserving these practices in order to ensure highly committed employees’, and ultimately making sure that employees will accept and embrace new change initiatives.

**Limitation**

This study has some methodological and theoretical limitations that need to be addressed. The first limitation concerns whether the sample is representative for the Police organization as a whole. As the sample is limited to only one district in the Norwegian Police, and the response rate were considered not ideal. Another related limitation concerns the generalizability of the current study. Samples from private sectors, as well as police organizations from other countries may produce differing results.

Secondly, the present study used a cross-sectional research design, meaning that all data was collected simultaneously. Whereas cross-sectional studies are often suitable to infer causation between two or more variables, still the result cannot differentiate between cause and effect (Mann, 2003). Put another way, the study provides evidence of a positive relationship between organizational climate, Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change. However, the causality between these constructs might differ from what is proposed in this thesis. For instance, Oreg et al. (2011) argued that Organizational Commitment might be both a pre-change and post-change condition. Meaning that successful change might increase employee’s commitment to the work-place. There is no ad-hoc remedy for drawing conclusions about causality, and the only solution would be to conduct the same study longitudinally, yet longitudinally studies are often logistically difficult to obtain. Additionally, as this study is one of the first to examine the relationship between CVF’s climate types, Organizational Commitment and Readiness for Change. It was considered important to establish associative relationships between these variables before conducting a time-consuming study to conclude causality.
Thirdly, another limitation might occur as a result of using self-report surveys, which is frequently associated with common method variance (CMV). Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, and Podsakoff (2003, p. 879) described CMV as “variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the construct the measures represent”. Potential sources of CMV are social desirability, response format fatigue, or caused by predictor and criterion variables being measured using the same scale (i.e. increased risk of Type 1 error) (Conway & Lance, 2010; Podsakoff et al., 2003). Social desirability is caused by respondents’ tendency to present themselves in a favorable light, accordingly it is a potential source to biased answers, which might alter the true relationship between variables (Podsakoff et al., 2003). However, social desirability is often more prominent in studies using interviews or paper-and-pencil questionnaires compared to online questionnaires (Richman, Kiesler, Weisband, & Drasgow, 1999). Response format fatigue on the other hand is related to the scale length. Shorter questionnaires are perceived favorable because it decreases the risk of respondents’ fatigue, which might result in former questions priming responses to current items (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Measures were made in order to reduce the likelihood of Type 1 error. To reduce the risk of priming the subjects towards the outcome variables, Readiness for Change was presented as the last measure in the questionnaire. Additionally, in order to decrease the risk of social desirability bias, the questionnaire was distributed online, and respondents were ensured full anonymity of the responses.

Fourth, as previously discussed, the high correlation between the CVF’s climate types might impose a problem of discriminant validity. Although alterations were made to the model in order to improve discriminant validity, high covariances between these constructs in the final model indicate that there might still be problems with multicollinearity (associated with occurrence of Type 2 error). Conversely, the final model did not display any visible signs of multicollinearity other than high covariances. CR of each of the climate dimensions was considered high (above .85), which makes type 2 error less likely to occur. Regardless, further testing and examination of the model is necessitated in order to determine whether or not the scale is appropriate for measuring four distinct climates.

Lastly, the exclusion of several items in all of the CVF’s climates might have manipulated the presented results. All of the items that were excluded opposed severe discriminant- and convergent validity issues. All excluded items where theoretically examined prior to elimination, and accordingly argued to not limit the constructs content validity. However, as previously discusses, the exclusion of two items in the Human Relation scale (HR7 and HR8) and three items in the Internal Process scale (IP5, IP6, and IP7) might have caused a limited explanatory power of these construct to both Organizational
Commitment and Readiness for Change. The Human Relation climate’s emphasis on training, and Internal Process climate’s emphasis on productivity was not represented in the scale after exclusion. However, all items were argued to conceptually differ from the intended construct. Nevertheless, the exclusion of these items might have resulted in misrepresenting these climates explanatory power in the final structural model and should therefore be recognized as a limitation for the present study.

**Future Research**

The results stipulated by the present study postulate opportunities for future research, both based on theoretical implications and limitations. Some of these have already been suggested, such as further testing and development of both the CVF and Organizational Commitment scale in order to increase validity. In addition, future research would benefit from using multiple techniques for measuring relationship between variables suggested by the present study. Such a study would benefit from using either interviews or observation in addition to questionnaires to reduce the risk of CMV. However, such studies are often recognized to be time-consuming, which requires the researchers to focus on a smaller sample as such studies requires more resources. Another option could be to include register data. For instance, as researchers have shown a high correlation between turnover and Organizational Commitment (Meyer et al., 2002), an interesting approach would have been to include turnover rates. However, this would also raise questions on whether such data is relevant within the police. As officers in the Norwegian Police need to have a bachelor’s degree before entering the police service, this might cause lower turnover rates because they feel restricted to the organization.

Moreover, future research should investigate these variables longitudinally, in order to determine causality. The cross-sectional research design used in the present study is only appropriate in order to infer causation between variables, but it cannot discriminate between cause and effect. However, longitudinal designs often cause difficulties with participants withdrawing their contribution. Additionally, extending the sample size to include several districts within the Norwegian Police organization would be beneficial in order to ensure representativeness of the findings. Similarly, it would also be valuable to replicate this study on other organizations in order to determine whether or not these findings are applicable to other organizations as well.

Further exploration of antecedents for all CVF climate dimensions are needed in order to provide awareness into how these climates are shaped and whether and how they could be changed. Previous research has pointed to managerial practices as important antecedents of organizational climate (Kuenzi & Schminke, 2009). An interesting approach would be to
consider how distinctive managerial practices and leadership behavior differentially predicts each of the CVF climate dimensions.

Lastly, the result of this study indicated that the relationship between organizational climate and Readiness for Change is complex. Future studies should explore this relationship deeper. Additionally, this study focused on how individuals’ attitudes might mediate between climate and employees’ willingness to support and embrace organizational change. However, future research should explore the possibility of other mediating variables, in order to further contribute to the literature on Readiness for Change.

**Conclusion**

The results of this study consolidate prior literature by providing empirical evidence about the organizational climate’s influence on employee’s attitudes towards change. Specifically, the result indicate that Organizational Commitment fully mediates between Rational Goal Climate and Readiness for Change. Additionally, the result implicated that Human Relation Climate was negatively associated with Readiness for Change within the Norwegian Police. Furthermore, Open System Climate was positively associated with employee’s beliefs and attitudes towards change. This study highlights the complex relationship between organizational climate and Readiness for Change and contributes with insight on potential antecedents of Readiness for Change.

Hopefully, this thesis inspires researchers to further explore the relationship discovered in this study. Further research would benefit from examining other mediating variables between CVF’s climate types and Readiness for Change.
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### APPENDIX 1: Measures in Norwegian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Item name</th>
<th>Item statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Relation climate</td>
<td>HR1</td>
<td>Vi utvikler støttende, positive arbeidsforhold her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR2</td>
<td>Arbeidsmiljøet er sånn at vi på enheten kommer godt overens med hverandre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR3</td>
<td>Vi har lite konflikt mellom oss på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR4</td>
<td>Vi er forpliktet til hverandre her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR5</td>
<td>Det er høy moral blant ansatte på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR6</td>
<td>På min enhet hjelper vi ansatte hverandre når det trengs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR7</td>
<td>Hver ansatt har muligheter for utvikling her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HR8</td>
<td>Hver ansatt har muligheter for faglig utvikling her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interna</td>
<td>IP1</td>
<td>Regler og retningslinjer er tydelig kommunisert til oss her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l Process</td>
<td>IP2</td>
<td>Etablerte prosedyrer og retningslinjer styrer generelt hvordan vi løser våre arbeidsoppgaver her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate</td>
<td>IP3</td>
<td>Vi på enheten blir oppfordret til å følge vår stillingsinstruks/stillingsbeskrivelse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS1</td>
<td>OS2</td>
<td>På denne enheten er vi i stand til å tilpasse oss nye krav når de oppstår</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open System</td>
<td>OS3</td>
<td>Vi er fleksible nok til å ta på oss nye oppgaver etter hvert som de oppstår her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>climate</td>
<td>OS4</td>
<td>Endringer blir godt tatt imot på denne enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS5</td>
<td>OS6</td>
<td>Vi er i stand til å gjøre endringer på driftsrutiner som kreves her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS7</td>
<td>OS8</td>
<td>Vi er alltid klare for å ta tak i nye utfordringer her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS9</td>
<td>OS10</td>
<td>På min enhet er vi opptatt av å holde oss oppdatert med utviklingen i samfunnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS11</td>
<td>OS12</td>
<td>Vi blir oppmunert til å finne nye løsninger på problemer her på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Item name</td>
<td>Item statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Goal Climate</td>
<td>RG1</td>
<td>Det er viktig for oss på enheten å nå våre satte mål</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG2</td>
<td>Vi legger vekt på å sette mål for enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG3</td>
<td>Det er viktig at vi på enheten planlegger for fremtiden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG4</td>
<td>Vi her på enheten har alltid planer om å gjøre forbedringer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG5</td>
<td>Vi blir belønnet for å nå mål het på enheten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG6</td>
<td>Vi her på enheten leter etter nye måter å gjøre ting på</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RG7</td>
<td>På min enhet er vi kjent med de langsiktige planene og retningene for politiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>COM1</td>
<td>Jeg opplever at mine verdier og politiets verdier er svært like</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM2</td>
<td>Jeg er villig til å gjøre en innsats ut over det som normalt forventes for å bidra til at politiet skal lykkes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM3</td>
<td>Jeg føler meg ikke som en &quot;del av familien&quot; i politiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM4</td>
<td>Jeg opplever virkelig at politiets problemer er mine egne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM5</td>
<td>Politiet inspirerer meg til å yte mitt aller beste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM6</td>
<td>Jeg er ikke &quot;følelsesmessig knyttet&quot; til politiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM7</td>
<td>Jeg er stolt av å kunne si til andre at jeg er en del av politiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM8</td>
<td>Jeg ville akseptert nesten hvilken som helst arbeidsoppgave så lenge jeg fikk fortsette å jobbe for politiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COM9</td>
<td>Jeg har ingen sterk følelse av tilhørighet til politiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>CHA1</td>
<td>Når endringer skjer på min enhet tror jeg at jeg er klar for å takle dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA2</td>
<td>Jeg prøver vanligvis å overbevise folk på min enhet om å akseptere endring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA3</td>
<td>Når endringer skjer på min enhet pleier jeg å klage på dem heller enn å gjøre noe med dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA4</td>
<td>Jeg tror jeg er mer klar for å akseptere endring enn mine kolleger på min enhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA5</td>
<td>Jeg er ikke bekymret for endringer på min enhet fordi jeg tror at det er en måte å takle dem på</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA6</td>
<td>Når endringer skjer på min enhet har jeg stort sett til hensikt å støtte dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHA7</td>
<td>Jeg er sikker på at jeg raskt vil kunne tilpasse meg endringer på min enhet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Measurement model 1 – Path Diagram
APPENDIX 3: Structural Model - Haywood Cases
APPENDIX 4: Pattern Matrix - Exploratory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
<th>Pattern Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR1</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR2</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR3</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR4</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR5</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR6</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR7</td>
<td>1,04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR8</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP1</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP2</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP3</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP4</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP5</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP6</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP7</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Extraction method: Maximum Likelihood.  
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.  
Factor Loading <.30 is not displayed
APPENDIX 5: Measurement model 2 – Path diagram
APPENDIX 6 – Alternative Structural model